



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1480  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,727	10/29/2001	G. Jae Lee	J6698(C)	5508

7590 10/28/2003

David A. Gay  
MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY  
4370 La Jolla Village Drive  
7th Floor  
San Diego, CA 92122

EXAMINER

HARDEE, JOHN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1751	

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

10/017,727

**Applicant(s)**

LEE ET AL.

**Examiner**

John R Hardee

**Art Unit**

1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jones et al., US 4,753,844. See example 8. The examiner takes the position that the solvents and the surfactants will act to reduce the activity of the water.
3. Claims 1-5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fowler et al., US 5,980,931. See, for example, Example 5, in which 1.5 g of the composition is coated onto 2 g of substrate. The examiner takes the position that the solvents and the surfactants will act to reduce the activity of the water.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones et al., US 4,753,844. The reference discloses disposable semi-moist wipes comprising a non-woven substrate, an aqueous cleaning composition loaded onto the substrate at less than 75% of the capacity of the substrate, one or more anionic surfactants and a water-miscible solvent (abstract). Glycol solvents are disclosed at col. 7, lines 10 and 11. Note Example 12, in which a nonwoven substrate was impregnated with an equal weight of each of compositions 1-9. Water is present at just under 40% of the composition, and foaming anionic surfactant is present as well. This reference differs from the claimed subject matter in that it does not disclose a

composition which reads on all of applicant's claims with sufficient specificity to constitute anticipation.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to make such a composition, because this reference teaches that all of the ingredients recited by applicants are suitable for inclusion in a surfactant composition impregnated on a nonwoven wipe. The person of ordinary skill in the surfactant art would expect the recited compositions to have properties similar to those compositions which are exemplified, absent a showing to the contrary.

In the case where the claimed ranges overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art, a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists. *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976); *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed Cir. 1990).

5. Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 870,496 A2. The reference discloses skin cleaning sheets with an aqueous composition containing 1-50% by weight of a nonionic surfactant and 1-30% by weight of a polyhydric alcohol or a glycol ether (abstract). Suitable alcohols include glycerol (p. 3, line 43). Salts may be added at 0.1-10% by weight (p. 2, line 55). The most preferred surfactants are ethoxylated fatty acids (p. 3, lines 25+), which applicant includes among suitable foaming surfactants (specification, [00026]). Inorganic salts may be used (p. 4, line 1). The sheet may be impregnated with the composition at 1-10 g of the composition per g of sheet. This reference differs from the claimed subject matter in that

Art Unit: 1751

it does not disclose a composition which reads on applicant's claims with sufficient specificity to constitute anticipation.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to make such a composition, because this reference teaches that all of the ingredients recited by applicants are suitable for inclusion in an aqueous surfactant composition which is coated on a sheet. The person of ordinary skill in the surfactant art would expect the recited compositions to have properties similar to those compositions which are exemplified, absent a showing to the contrary.

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102( b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Fowler et al., US 5,980,931. The reference discloses a substantially dry disposable cleansing wipe comprising a lathering surfactant and a conditioning agent (abstract). Suitable surfactants include anionics (see examples) and cationics may be added as well (col. 19, lines 18+). Glycerol may be added (examples). It is not clear whether or not Polyquaternium-10 meets applicant's definition of a cationic agent salt. If it does, the claim is anticipated by Example 5, among others. If not, it would be obvious to add a cationic agent salt as defined by applicant, because the reference discloses at col. 19, lines 18+ that this may be done.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed September 1, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant points to examples 1-3 of the Jones reference, and

notes that the water content of these examples does not meet the claim limitations. While this is correct, it is not persuasive because example 8 clearly meets the water limitations, as well as the other limitations. Applicant further argues that the disclosure at col. 9, lines 26+ teaches away from the use of foaming surfactants. This is not persuasive because this passage only teaches that foaming is not desirable in the formulation of window cleaning wipes. As the cleaning of other surfaces is clearly disclosed, as is the use of surfactants which are well known in the art as foaming surfactants, the reference fairly teaches the use of wipes which can generate foam in the process of cleaning.

Applicant's arguments regarding the formulation of "substantially dry" wipes in the Fowler reference is well taken, but compositions which meet the claim limitations are disclosed in the examples. These wipes are subsequently dried in an oven, but this disclosure anticipates the claim limitations anyway. The reference teaches that the wipes are to be wetted with water by the consumer prior to use.

Applicant argues that the EP reference does not present a prima facie case of evidence because the examples contain more water than is recited by applicant. This is not persuasive because one could readily make a wipe which does meet applicant's limitations by working in the middle of the ranges disclosed in the reference.

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 1751

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to the examiner, Dr. John R. Hardee, whose telephone number is (703) 305-5599. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 until 4:30. In the event that the examiner is not available, his supervisor, Dr. Yogendra Gupta, may be reached at (703) 308-4708.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Hardee', with a stylized, cursive script.

John R. Hardee  
Primary Examiner  
October 21, 2003